

**REMARKS**

By way of this amendment and reply to the Office Action mailed July 31, 2002, new claims 14-18 have been added. Therefore, claims 2-18 are presently pending for further consideration on the merits.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowance of claims 5-7, 9, 10 and 13 as made in the Office Action.

In the Office Action, claims 2-4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,815,301 to Naiki et al.; and claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Naiki et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,277 to Boku et al. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Contrary to the assertions made in the Office Action, Naiki et al. does not disclose or suggest lenses having functions similar to those of the lenses recited in claims 2-4, 8, 11 and 12.

In particular, the Office Action asserts that lens 203b described in column 16, lines 45-65 of Naiki et al. is equivalent to the resin lens recited in the claims under rejection. Unlike the lenses of the claims under rejection, however, lens 203b of Naiki et al. does not have a radius of curvature in a second direction that is varied along a first direction. This can be understood from the data shown in Tables 2-7, 11 and 12 of the present specification. To be more specific, lens 203b of Naiki et al. is a cylindrical lens, and its radius of curvature in the sub-scanning direction does not vary along the main scanning direction.

Admittedly, lens 19 as shown in Figure 7 of the present drawings (which is a glass lens) may be a cylindrical lens. However, the surfaces of lens 17 satisfies the conditions as shown in Table 1 or 4A of the present specification, for example. Therefore, the lens obtained by combining these lenses 17 and 19 differs distinctly from a cylindrical lens such as that disclosed in Naiki et al.,

and thus the teachings of Naiki et al. are not pertinent to the claims under rejection. For example, claim 12 recites a resin lens having a surface whose radius of curvature in a direction chosen from the group consisting of a first direction and a second direction (these directions being substantially perpendicular to each other) is varied along the other direction chosen from the group. Clearly, Naiki et al.'s cylindrical lens 203b does not disclose or suggest these features. Since Boku does not rectify the shortcomings of Naiki et al., claims 2-4, 8, 11 and 12 are all believed to patentably distinguish over the teachings of these references.

New claims 14-18 have been added to recite additional features of the resin lens that are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited art of record.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

October 31, 2002

for

Pavan K. Agarwal

Registration No. 40,888

Reg. No.  
38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143  
Telephone: (202) 672-5426  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.